

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 6-7, and 12 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,899,276 to Stadler (hereinafter "Stadler"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method of displaying a static information tip comprises the steps of focusing on the first data field; solely in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; focusing on the second data field; and in response to focusing on the second data field, displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field. Similarly, claim 7 recites that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform the steps of focusing on the first data field; solely in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; focusing on the second data field; and in response to focusing on the second data field, displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field.

Stadler does not teach or suggest a method of displaying a static information tip or a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions as recited by claims 1 and 7, respectively. On the contrary, Stadler discloses a field-directed screen help technique for a data entry system including the steps of positioning the cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired; pressing a "help" key, such as the F1 key; and in response to the "help key" being pressed, displaying a "window" which provides an explanation that is specifically directed to the field in which the cursor is located. This is not analogous to the method of claim 1 or the computer readable medium of claim 7 because unlike the present invention which recites displaying a static information tip

proximate to a data field solely in response to focusing on the data field, Stadler teaches that a user must first position the cursor in a field which the user desires an explanation to be directed *and* then press the F1 or "help" key to display a window providing the explanation directed to the field in which the cursor is located. Thus, Stadler teaches that two steps must be performed, positioning the cursor in a field and then pressing the F1 key, in order to display a window providing an explanation, in contrast to the method and computer readable medium of claims 1 and 7, respectively, which recite one step, focusing on the data field, to display a static information tip.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Stadler. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stadler in view of United States Patent No. 4,646,250 to Childress (hereinafter "Childress"), and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,736,984 to Jellinek et al. (hereinafter "Jellinek"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Stadler. Since claims 2-5 and 8-11 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Stadler, Childress, and Jellinek does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-5 and 8-11 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 6 recites that a method of displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprises the steps of focusing on a first data field; solely in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; determining the data entered into the first data field is erroneous; placing an error marker adjacent to the first data field; refocusing on the first data field; and displaying a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, the second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the first data field.

Stadler fails to teach or suggest a method of displaying a static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 6. On the contrary, as discussed above, Stadler teaches a field-directed help screen technique including the steps of positioning the cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired; pressing a "help" key, such as the F1 key; and in response to the "help key" being pressed, displaying a "window" which provides an explanation that is specifically directed to the field in which the cursor is located. This is not analogous to the method of claim 6 because Stadler teaches that two steps must be performed, positioning the cursor and then pressing the F1 key, in order to display a window providing an explanation, in contrast to the method of claim 6 which recites one step, focusing on the data field, to display a static information tip.

Moreover, Stadler teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed, without suggesting that the data entered into the data fields is determined erroneous, an error marker is placed adjacent to the data fields, the data fields are refocused on, and a second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the data fields is displayed. In fact, Stadler fails to teach or suggest any means for detecting or handling errors within a data field.

The Office Action recognizes that Stadler fails to disclose means for detecting or handling errors within a field, as recited by the present invention, and relies on the teaching of Childress to allegedly cure the deficiencies of the teaching of Stadler. However, like Stadler, Childress fails to teach or suggest a method of displaying a static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 6. Instead, Childress teaches a method for redisplaying erroneous information entered by a user including checking the correctness of data entered by a user into a data entry field, and if an error is detected, then redisplaying the incorrectly entered data with highlighting, without suggesting providing a first information tip solely in response to focusing on the data entry field and providing a second information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the data entry field. Therefore, like Stadler, Childress fails to teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claim 6.

The Office Action recognizes that the combined teaching of Stadler and Childress does not provide means for displaying a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, as recited by the present invention, and relies on the teaching of Jellinek to allegedly cure these deficiencies. However, like Stadler and Childress, Jellinek does not teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claim 6. Instead, Jellinek teaches a method for processing user defined input including receiving input data from a user in a first graphical processing element; determining whether the input data is valid; and if the input is determined invalid, displaying a feedback message in combination with the first graphical processing element in a second graphical processing element. This is not analogous to the method recited in claim 6 because Jellinek fails to teach or suggest providing a first static information tip solely in response to focusing on the graphical processing element. Therefore, like Stadler and Childress, Jellinek fails to teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claim 6.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Stadler, Childress, and Jellinek and subsequently modify the teaching of Stadler as suggested in the Office Action absent the impermissible use of hindsight because, as discussed above, Stadler does not teach or suggest any means for detecting or handling errors within a data field. Instead, Stadler teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed. However, there is no suggestion in the teaching of Stadler that prior to displaying the next data entry screen or after the next data entry screen is displayed, the data fields are checked to determine if the data entered into the fields is erroneous, and if so, providing information to correct the erroneous data. Thus, the only motivation for such a combination of teachings and subsequent modification of the teaching of Stadler has been deemed from a review of Applicants' invention, not from what is being taught or suggested from the cited art. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the teaching of Stadler with the teachings of Childress and Jellinek is improper.

For at least these reasons, claim 6 is allowable over combined teaching of Stadler, Childress, and Jellinek. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 12 recites that a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprises a computer program module operative to focus on a first data field; to display a first static information tip proximate to the first data field solely in response to focusing on the first data field; to determine the data entered into the first data field is erroneous; to place an error marker adjacent to the first data field; to refocus on the first data field; and to display a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, the second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the first data field.

Stadler does not teach or suggest a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 12. On the contrary, Stadler teaches a system for providing a user assistance in making data entries operative to detect positioning of a cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired; detect whether a “help” key, such as the F1 key, has been pressed; and in response to the “help” key being pressed, display a “window” which provides an explanation that is specifically directed to the field in which the cursor is located. This is not analogous to the system of claim 12 because Stadler fails to teach or suggest that the system is operative to display a first static information tip proximate to the first data field solely in response to focusing on the first data field. Instead, Stadler teaches that the system is operative to detect positioning of the cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired and to display a “window” which provides an explanation directed to the field in which the cursor is located in response to detecting that the “help” key has been pressed.

Moreover, Stadler teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the system is operative to automatically display the next data entry screen or to require that a SAVE key is pressed before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed. However, Stadler fails to teach or suggest that the system is operative to determine that the data entered into the data fields is erroneous, place an error marker adjacent the data fields, refocus on the data fields, and display a second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the data

fields. In fact, Stadler fails to teach or suggest any means for detecting or handling errors within a data field.

The Office Action recognizes that Stadler fails to disclose means for detecting or handling errors within a field, as recited by the present invention, and relies on the teaching of Childress to allegedly cure the deficiencies of the teaching of Stadler. However, like Stadler, Childress does not teach or suggest a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 12. In contrast, Childress teaches an interactive data entry system that checks the correctness of the data entered by a user into a data entry field, and if an error is detected, then redisplay the incorrectly entered data with highlighting, without suggesting that the interactive data entry system is operative to provide a first information tip solely in response to focusing on the data entry field and provide a second information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the data entry field. Therefore, like Stadler, Childress fails to teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claim 12.

The Office Action recognizes that the combined teaching of Stadler and Childress does not provide means for displaying a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, as recited by the present invention, and relies on the teaching of Jellinek to allegedly cure these deficiencies. However, like Stadler and Childress, Jellinek does not teach or suggest a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 12. On the contrary, Jellinek teaches an apparatus for processing user defined input operative to receive input data from a user in a first graphical processing element; determine whether the input data is valid; and if the input is determined invalid, display a feedback message in combination with the first graphical processing element in a second graphical processing element. This is not analogous to the system of claim 12 because Jellinek fails to teach or suggest that the apparatus is operative to provide a first static information tip solely in response to focusing on the graphical processing element. Therefore, like Stadler and Childress, Jellinek fails to teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claim 12.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Stadler, Childress, and Jellinek and subsequently modify the teaching of Stadler as suggested in the Office

Action absent the impermissible use of hindsight because, as discussed above, Stadler does not teach or suggest any means for detecting or handling errors within a data field. Instead, Stadler teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed. However, there is no suggestion in the teaching of Stadler that prior to displaying the next data entry screen or after the next data entry screen is displayed, the data fields are checked to determine if the data entered into the fields is erroneous, and if so, providing information to correct the erroneous data. Thus, the only motivation for such a combination of teachings and subsequent modification of the teaching of Stadler has been deemed from a review of Applicants' invention, not from what is being taught or suggested from the cited art. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the teaching of Stadler with the teachings of Childress and Jellinek is improper.

For at least these reasons, claim 12 is allowable over the combined teaching of Stadler, Childress, and Jellinek. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the final Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-12 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' attorney at 404.954.5042.



MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404/954-5100

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alton Hornsby, III", written over a horizontal line.

Alton Hornsby, III
Reg. No. 47,299